RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 2 2 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 19 were again rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Phillips, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,899,681). Claims 6-11, 13-18, and 20-23 were objected to being dependent on a rejected base claim, but allowable if amended into independent form. Claims 24-31 were allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-5 and 19, including independent claims 1 and 19. *New arguments are added in italics below.*

Independent claim 1 claims setting a transmit level, and automatically selecting a setting for at least one contrast agent imaging parameter as a function of the transmit level and in response to the setting of the transmit level. Phillips, et al. do not disclose these limitations.

Philips, et al. disclose automated power level setting for contrast agent imaging (title; and abstract). In particular, the transmit power is set for low mechanical index contrast agent imaging (col. 1, lines 48-50; and col. 2, lines 47-49). The transmit level is set to minimize destruction while maximizing signal-to-noise ratio (col. 2, lines 49-54). Different contrast agent imaging detection techniques and associated settings are described as useful for different purposes (col. 3, line 31-col. 4, line 4). For setting the transmit level, the contrast agent imaging is activated to identify in-flow of contrast agents (col. 4, lines 29-35). The contrast agent imaging may be altered to image a portion of the scan plane (col. 9, line 65-col. 10, line 6). After setting contrast agent detection, the transmit power level is automatically set (col. 5, lines 26-28 and 37-39; and figures 3 and 5). The cited acts of figures 3 and 5 show detecting to set the transmit level. Phillips, et al. do not change detection, but adjust transmit levels or timing to set the transmit power. There is no suggestion to automatically select a setting for a contrast agent imaging parameter as a function of and in response to setting the transmit level.

The Examiner points to Fig. 5, elements 78, 86 and 94 "where Phillips teaches setting parameters for contrast agent medical imaging comprising: setting a transmit level (element

78) and automatically applying a detection technique (element 86 and 94) based on the function of the transmit level" (Office Action dated April 4, 2007, page 2).

Applicants disagree with this characterization of Phillips, et al. Figure 5 alone shows beginning transmit at a setting P (element 78). Elements 86 and 94 merely show applying the detection technique. There is no suggestion to apply a different technique for different transmit settings. Through loop 104-106-82, a different transmit power may be set. The same apply detection technique elements 86 and 94 are applied after the loop. Since different transmit powers are contemplated in Fig. 5, "setting" and "decrease" (elements 78 and 104) are associated with transmitting. However, no such variability of setting of the detection technique is shown. The detection technique is just applied. Figure 5 does not suggest automatically selecting a setting for a contrast agent imaging parameter as a function of the transmit level and in response to setting the transmit level. Applying of elements 86 and 94 is not selecting a setting as a function of the transmit level and in response to the setting of the transmit level.

The description for Figure 5 clearly indicates an algorithm for setting the transmit power level (Col. 6, lines 45-55). Acts 86 and 94 are merely described as "detected" (Col. 6, lines 60 and 65; Col. 7, line 8). Unlike transmit power, there is o suggestion to select a setting for detection. Phillips, et al. use detection, but do not disclose selecting a setting for a contrast agent imaging parameter or detecting as a function of the transmit level and in response to setting the transmit level.

Independent claim 19 recites altering a transmit level and a transmit sequence in response to a single user input control, with at least two different transmit levels being associated with at least one of the transmit sequences. Phillips, et al. alter transmit level and/or timing to set a transmit level. The process for setting transmit level is automated. There is no suggestion to alter the sequence and transmit level in response to a single user input control.

The Examiner did not address these arguments for Claim 19. The Examiner cites to acts 36 and 50, the abstract, and acts 78 and 94. None of these disclose a user input. Acts 36, 50-, 78 and 94 are part of algorithms for automated setting of transmit power (Col. 2,

lines 47-54). User control is undesired (Col. 1, lines 25-41). Phillips, et al. desired automated setting of the transmit power (in the abstract) so do not recite altering transmit level and the sequence in response to a single user input.

Dependent claims 2-5 depend on independent claim 1, so are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. The dependent claims are patentable over Phillips, et al. for additional reasons. Claim 2 recites setting transmit level by a user with a single control, so is allowable for the same reasons as claim 19. Claims 4 and 5 recite selecting the setting, or one of the setting and a system gain as a function of the measured characteristic. Phillips, et al. set the transmit level, *not the setting or system gain.*

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 2 2 2007

CONCLUSION:

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (650) 943-7554 or Craig Summerfield at (312) 321-4726.

PLEASE MAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Siemens Corporation
Customer No. 28524
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

Respectfully submitted,

Anand Sethuraman, Reg. No. 43,351
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)
Telephone: 650-943-7554
Date: 5/22/07